

REMARKS

Claims 10 to 22 are now pending in the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

With respect to paragraph six (6) of the Office Action, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 13 to 15 and 19 to 22 contain allowable subject matter. Since, however, the base claims are allowable as explained herein, the objections are respectfully traversed, and it is therefore respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

With respect to page one (1), claims 10 to 12, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,907,540 to "Hayashi" (the "Hayashi" reference) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,054 to Mosebrook et al. (the "Lau" reference).

For a claim to be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), not only must the prior art disclose or suggest each element of the claim, but the prior art must also suggest combining the elements in the manner contemplated by the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. M.P.E.P. §2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the references and that, when so modified or combined, the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. §2143. It is respectfully submitted that these criteria for obviousness are not met here.

Independent claim 10 relates to a bus station for exchanging with other bus stations a communication including a data packet and transmission information. The bus station includes an arrangement for storing position information of the bus station in relation to a sequence of bus stations and an arrangement for determining from the transmission information position information of the one of the bus stations that is transmitting. The bus station according to claim 10 also includes an arrangement for, on receiving the communication, determining a time slot belonging to the bus station on the basis of the position information of the one of the bus stations that is transmitting and the position information of the bus station. The bus station according to claim 10 also includes an arrangement for sending the communication including the data packet after the data packet is received, the communication being sent in a next time slot belonging to the bus station.

The examiner admits that the feature "determining a time slot belonging to the bus station based on position information and transmitting the packet in the next time slot belonging to the bus station" does not follow from the primary "Hayashi" reference.

In addition, the feature of an "arrangement for determining, from the transmission information, position information of the one of the bus stations that is transmitting" is also not disclosed or suggested by the secondary "Mosebrook" reference.

Still further, the "Mosebrook" reference does not disclose the feature of "determining a time slot belonging to the bus station on the basis of the position information of the one of the bus stations that is transmitting *and the position information of the bus station.*" The passages referred to in the Office Action (column 26, lines 49 through 61) refers to a repeater being able to repeat a message in its time slot -- but the secondary "Mosebrook" reference does not describe anywhere how the repeater ascertains its time slot. This remains completely open. In particular, it is not in any way disclosed, suggested or even implied anywhere in the "Mosebrook" reference that the repeater (as in claim 10) *ascertains the time slot on the basis of two information items*, namely from the knowledge of the position information of the transmitting bus station and its own position information.

Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable, as are its dependent claims 11 to 22.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 10 to 22 of the present application are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/20/2006

By: Gerard A. Messina

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

(1540)
leg. no.
33,865
Harmon C.
DEPT